

Amendments to the Drawings

The Examiner has objected to the drawings under 37 CFR 1.83(a) due to their failure to show every feature of the invention as specified in the claims. Applicants submit herewith replacement drawings which contain corrections to the drawing sheets containing Figures 1 - 6. No new matter has been added.

REMARKS

Claims 1-10 are pending in the present application.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-10 due to informalities. Applicants have amended claims 1 and 10 to correct the informalities as set forth by the Examiner.

Although not objected to, applicants have amended the specification to correct a typographical error in reference to one of the Figures.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC § 112

Claims 1-10 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enabling requirement. Applicant has amended claim 1 to overcome this rejection.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner regarding the enablement of the methods of placing carriers of different colors. With respect to inkjet printing technology, the specification describes in detail in paragraphs 30, 31, and 32, in conjunction with Figure 2, a method for using inkjet technology to place carriers of different colors on a medium. It describes a suggested number of printheads to use and it describes a suggested number of drops/second. Even though applicant contends that appropriate disclosure is provided even for submicron pit sizes, the description is not limited to such a size. Paragraph 21 of the application states "The present invention provides a method for increasing the storage capability of a disk drive regardless of the physical dimensions of the pits." Therefore the disclosure is not limited to the .32 micron pit size suggested by the Examiner. In light of this disclosure, the Examiner's rejection regarding inkjet printing is moot.

With respect to Laser induced technology, applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner. Paragraphs 36-38 in conjunction with Figures 3A and 3B describes in detail a method for using laser induced technology for placing color carriers. In addition,

the description references an article on how to shape nano-particles. One of skill in the art is thus provided all the necessary description to practice this method of placing color carriers without undue experimentation. The Examiner contends that the cited article is not related to optical recording and suggests that the only teaching is a single paragraph as to how it could be applied to optical recording. Applicant contends that it is this paragraph in conjunction with the entire detailed disclosure that teaches one of skill in the art how to use laser technology to implement the invention.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC § 102

Claims 1 and 2 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Glushko et al. (US 6,291,132). Applicant respectfully disagrees. Glushko does not teach, describe, or suggest the invention of independent claim 1 because Glushko lacks at least one element of the claimed invention. Glushko is directed to a multilayer storage system where only one layer can be read at a time. Although each layer may be of a different wavelength, the layers are not read at the same time. Only one color is detected at any one time in Glushko. By contrast, the claimed invention includes the limitation of placing a plurality of carriers at a single storage location on a medium. Thus, all colors are used to represent data, and not a single color as in Glushko. For the foregoing reasons, Glushko does not teach, describe, or suggest the claimed invention.

Claims 1-4, 6 and 9 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Bawendi et al. (US 6,774,361 B2). Applicant respectfully disagrees. Bawendi does not teach, describe, or suggest the invention of independent claim 1 because Bawendi lacks at least one element of the claimed invention. Bawendi is directed to an inventory control system for identifying/locating components or items of interest. It does not describe a method of storing data on a data storage medium as set out in amended independent claim 1. Bawendi only teaches the use of quantum dots as replacements for bar codes. Bar codes (and the system of Bawendi) are used only for identification and tracking, and not for the storage of data on a data storage medium.

Because Bawendi lacks at least this element, it does not teach, describe, or suggest the claimed invention.

Claims 1, 3, 4 and 6-8 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by McGrew (US 6,692,031). Applicant respectfully disagrees. McGrew does not teach, describe, or suggest the invention of independent claim 1 because McGrew lacks at least one element of the claimed invention. McGrew is directed to a security service and system for identifying/locating security items. It does not describe a method of storing data on a data storage medium as set out in amended independent claim 1. McGrew only teaches the use of quantum dots as replacements for bar codes. Bar codes (and the system of McGrew) are used only for identification and tracking, and not for the storage of data on a data storage medium. Because McGrew lacks at least this element, it does not teach, describe, or suggest the claimed invention.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC § 103

Claim 5 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bawendi.

Claim 5 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McGrew.

Claims 7 and 9 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bawendi in view of McGrew.

Claim 10 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bawendi in view of Metz (US 5,166,813).

Claim 10 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McGrew in view of Metz (US 5,166,813).

With respect to the rejections of the dependent claims, Applicant contends that these claims are dependent on an allowable base claim and are themselves allowable. In addition, each dependent claim adds additional limitations not found in the prior art.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, applicants respectfully request that this application be reexamined and that the claims, as amended, be allowed.

A new POWER OF ATTORNEY and STATEMENT UNDER 3.73(b) were filed electronically on June 13, 2007. Applicants respectfully request that the Patent Office records be updated and that future correspondence regarding this application be sent to the undersigned.

Please charge any fees that may be due for the filing of this AMENDMENT or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 07-1896.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 27, 2007



J.D. Harriman II, Reg. 31,967

DLA Piper US LLP
1999 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 400
Los Angeles, California 90067-6023
Tel: (310) 595-3000
Fax: (310) 595-3300